UNITED
NATIONS

CERD

International Convention
on the Elimination
of all Forms of
Racial Discrimination

Distr.
GENERAL

CERD/C/SR.1120
18 August 1995

Original: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Forty-seventh session

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 1120th MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 15 August 1995, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. GARVALOV

later: Mr. SHERIFIS

later: Mr. GARVALOV

CONTENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Official Records Editing Section, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

GE.95-18451 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

ORGANIZATIONAL AND OTHER MATTERS (agenda item 2) (continued)

Draft general recommendation on article 5 (CERD/C/46/Misc.2/Rev.1)

1. Mr. WOLFRUM, introducing the draft general recommendation on article 5, said that he had incorporated the suggestions of other members in the revised text before the Committee.

2. There were two major problems with regard to the implementation of article 5 of the Convention: the general objective of the article and the question of the treatment of non-citizens. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the draft recommendation contained a description of the article and the restrictions on the rights embodied in it. Paragraph 3, however, dealt more specifically with the treatment of citizens as opposed to non-citizens. Both International Covenants spoke of rights as universal. The members of the Human Rights Committee were in total agreement that there should be no distinction between the rights of citizens and non-citizens, as could be seen from its general comment 15 on the "Position of aliens under the Covenant". The sole exception related to political rights, which included the right to vote, to participate in public affairs and to enter public service.

3. The Committee should consider its policy on the adoption of general recommendations and perhaps conform to the practice followed by the Human Rights Committee, as indicated in document HRI/GEN/1/Rev.1.

4. Mr. DIACONU said that the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights allowed developing countries to desist from granting foreigners the same rights as citizens. However, the question arose as to which developing countries they were. Developed countries were equally prone to differentiating between the social and economic rights that might be enjoyed by citizens and foreigners. In Western Europe, for example, a non-citizen needed a work permit before he or she could be employed, whereas there was no such stipulation for nationals. Was that racial discrimination or not?

5. The draft general recommendation would be acceptable only if amendments were made to ensure greater flexibility in its implementation. For example, paragraph 2 should refer to the terms of article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention and make it clear that whenever a State imposed distinctions, exclusions, restrictions or preferences upon one of the rights mentioned in article 5 in relation to foreigners, it should ensure that the restriction was proportionate to the objective sought and that it was fully compatible with article 1 of the Convention. Consideration of the draft general recommendation should be postponed until the forty-eighth session, by which time amendments to the present text could be submitted.

6. Mr. ABOUL-NASR proposed that consideration of the draft general recommendation should be deferred since substantive amendments to the Convention were at issue.

7. Mr. van BOVEN, speaking on a point of order, said that if consideration was to be postponed, members of the Committee should propose amendments to the present text before the next session, when the question of article 5 of the Convention should be settled once and for all.

8. Mr. YUTZIS, speaking on a point of order, proposed that members' amendments should be submitted in writing before the Committee's forty-eighth session.

9. Mr. FERRERO COSTA, speaking on a point of order, said that he agreed with the proposals made, but would like to suggest that consideration of the draft general recommendation on article 5 also be included as a separate agenda item and scheduled for the beginning of the next session.

10. Mr. SHAHI, speaking on a point of order, said that he endorsed the proposals made. In connection with article 1 of the Convention, particular attention should be paid to determining which specific rights should be enjoyed by all citizens and which rights need not be conferred equally on both citizens and non-citizens.

11. Mr. SHERIFIS, speaking on a point of order, said he could not agree that amendments should be admissible only if they were submitted in writing before the next session. Members should also be free to make proposals when the draft general recommendation was under consideration.

12. Mr. WOLFRUM said he was in favour of deferral on the basis of Mr. Aboul-Nasr's proposal. He also agreed with Mr. Sherifis that while members should be encouraged to submit proposed amendments prior to the next session, they should on no account be prevented from doing so orally or in writing during the session.

13. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that it had not been his intention to restrict the submission of amendments; he was not engaging in delaying tactics. However, he viewed the draft general recommendation as an amendment to the Convention and an attempt to impose the Committee's interpretation on States parties. His proposal had been to defer consideration until the next session, with "consideration" as the operative word.

14. The CHAIRMAN said that some members had gone further and proposed deferring consideration with a view to taking a final decision at the next session. He suggested that the Committee should adopt a decision along the following lines: "The Committee agrees to defer consideration of the draft general recommendation on article 5 proposed by Mr. Wolfrum until the forty-eighth session with a view to taking a decision".

15. It was so decided.

16. Mr. YUTZIS recommended a procedure to be followed whenever such matters arose for consideration. Members of the Committee should send in their views and comments as early as possible. A file on the subject concerned, including translations of all relevant material into the Committee's working languages, would then be compiled and distributed to members prior to the next session.

Draft decision with the aim of guiding the Committee in its deliberations on the reports of States parties and, in particular, in its decisions on urgent measures

17. Mr. WOLFRUM said that the draft decision, prepared in response to an initiative by the Bureau, had been circulated at the end of the previous session. The issue it addressed was extremely complex, of the utmost importance and fully within the Committee's mandate. He proposed that discussion of the matter should be deferred so that it could be given the attention it deserved.

18. Mr. de GOUTTES said that he fully supported Mr. Wolfrum's proposal to defer consideration of what was an extremely difficult subject.

19. Mr. DIACONU commended the draft decision, which was clearly the product of painstaking analysis and research. He agreed with the proposal to defer consideration of its content.

20. Mr. van BOVEN said that the draft decision reflected a general discussion at the previous session which had focused on the right of self-determination and the rights of minorities. He suggested that its consideration should be deferred on the understanding that a time-slot would be reserved for a substantive discussion of the subject.

21. Mr. YUTZIS agreed with the proposal for deferral on the understanding that his recommended procedure for the early submission of comments and translation into working languages was followed.

22. Mr. SHERIFIS proposed that the draft decision should be scheduled for discussion at the next session because of the importance of the issue it addressed. It was a matter that should not be left pending from session to session.

23. Mr. RECHETOV said the draft decision was the result of a lengthy discussion at the preceding session. He would go along with the consensus in favour of deferral of consideration, but regretted that such an important topic was being shelved with little show of concern at the current session.

24. Mr. FERRERO COSTA suggested that the draft decision should be included as a specific item on the agenda for the next session.

25. Mr. SHAHI noted that paragraph 4 of the draft decision referred to the "internal aspect" of the right to self-determination of peoples, defined as "the right of all peoples to freely determine their political status and to freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development". Did it follow that if Governments were not respecting the principle of internal self-determination, there was a right to secede? The reference in paragraph 6 to "sovereign independent States conducting themselves in compliance with the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and possessed of a government representing the whole people" also left a loophole for secession. The issue was extremely complicated and did not lend itself to conclusive answers. Each case must be considered on its merits. However, he was not opposed to further exploration of the subject and supported the proposal to defer consideration of the draft decision.

26. Mr. ABOUL-NASR drew attention to General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV), the "Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples", which was one of the first expositions of the right of self-determination. He maintained his position that the Committee should not engage in interpretation of the Convention or make statements regarding issues on which its views had not been sought.

27. Mr. SONG Shuhua said that the right of self-determination was a complex issue with historical, cultural and many other dimensions. He supported the proposal to defer consideration of the matter until the next session.

28. The CHAIRMAN said he took it that the Committee wished to defer consideration of the draft decision until its forty-eighth session.

29. It was so decided.

Draft letter from the Chairman of the Committee to the Chairman of the 16th meeting of States parties to the Convention (CERD/C/47/Misc.5/Rev.1)

30. Mr. DIACONU said he welcomed the letter drafted by Mr. Banton to the Chairman of the 16th meeting of States parties. He suggested including a paragraph drawing the attention of the Chairman, and hence of the States parties, to the need to ratify the amendments to article 8 of the Convention. He also suggested amending the opening sentence of the last paragraph to read: "The 16th meeting of States parties might like to consider proposals that they (a) meet annually to consider ways and means of supporting the Committee in the fulfilment of its mandate of monitoring the implementation of the Convention".

31. Mr. ABOUL-NASR expressed doubt whether such a letter was in conformity with the Committee's rules of procedure and the terms of reference of the meeting of States parties. He had the impression that the purpose of the meeting of States parties was to deal with limited administrative and electoral issues.

32. Mr. SHAHI said he thought there was little that the meeting of States parties could do to improve the situation with regard to overdue reports, short of issuing an exhortation or appeal. It was suggested in the last paragraph of the letter that holding an occasional session at United Nations Headquarters in New York might improve the Committee's contacts with defaulting States, but he feared that such a suggestion might draw adverse comments in the light of the financial situation of the United Nations.

33. Mr. van BOVEN said that in the early 1980s the advice of the Legal Counsel had been sought on the question whether the meeting of States parties could consider issues other than elections under an agenda item entitled "Other business". The conclusion of the Legal Counsel had been that it could. The Committee was therefore perfectly entitled, procedurally speaking, to address a communication to the meeting, which would then decide whether to take it into account.

34. With regard to the substance of the draft letter, he endorsed the amendments proposed by Mr. Diaconu. He would also welcome the inclusion of a reference to article 8, paragraph 6, of the Convention, to the effect that those States parties which had recommended the amendment to the General Assembly should encourage other States parties to ratify it.

35. Mr. AHMADU said that, apart from the practical problems entailed in sending such a letter, he had difficulty in grasping the purpose of some of the suggestions made in the last paragraph. For instance, he found quite unacceptable the idea of States parties establishing their own bureau to monitor, as it were, the Committee's proceedings. Perhaps the issues might best be approached from a different angle. It was easy enough for the Committee to send letters to the Secretary-General or other forums. The problem was "Would they be followed up?" Mr. van Boven had failed to mention the outcome of the Committee's previous communication to the meeting of States parties. In his view, the main concerns that should be covered in the letter were the implementation of Committee decisions, the timely submission of reports and ratification of the amendment to article 8, paragraph 6, of the Convention.

36. The CHAIRMAN suggested that Mr. Banton should redraft the letter, taking into account members' comments and suggestions. Speaking in a personal capacity, he said that he too was somewhat dubious about the wording of the last paragraph. Perhaps it should be deleted.

37. Mr. SHAHI stressed the need to impress on States parties the importance of ratifying the amendment to article 8 of the Convention. Mention might also be made of the Committee's disappointment at the fact that so far only 22 States parties had taken action along those lines.

38. Mr. SHERIFIS endorsed Mr. Shahi's remarks. Furthermore, it would useful, when considering the revised version of the letter, if the Committee had at its disposal a copy of the correspondence referred to by Mr. van Boven between the Legal Counsel of the United Nations and the Centre for Human Rights.

39. Mr. ABOUL-NASR observed that the support of Mr. Valencia Rodríguez would prove invaluable, since he was the only member of the Committee who was also entitled to speak as a representative at the meeting of States parties. Since he had been unable to attend the present meeting he should be briefed on the discussion.

40. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that the Committee agreed to the redrafting of the letter, which would be taken up later in the session. The secretariat would be requested to provide the relevant correspondence and Mr. Valencia Rodríguez would be duly informed of the outcome of the discussion.

41. It was so decided.

Draft statement concerning the participation of the Committee in the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations

42. The CHAIRMAN reminded members that the statement drafted by Mr. Banton at the Bureau's request had been taken up by the Committee during the forty-sixth session, but no decision had been reached.

43. Mr. BANTON said he had drafted the statement when it had seemed that a contribution was expected from the Committee. However, doubts had subsequently been expressed about its usefulness.

44. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that, to his knowledge, none of the members of the Committee or other treaty bodies had been invited to participate in the commemoration. As to the text, he questioned the accuracy of the reference to "new conflicts" which had "sprung from nowhere". Most of the conflicts under consideration were long-standing and had well-known and widely differing origins. Moreover, the criticism directed at the United Nations in the second paragraph seemed unwarranted, for the concept of racial discrimination as such had not been neglected. Lastly, some mention should be made of the Committee's work and the importance of preventive measures adopted, as well as the preventive diplomacy activities of the United Nations as a whole.

45. Mr. SHERIFIS suggested that before undertaking any redrafting, the secretariat should ascertain whether there would be a time-slot for the delivery of the statement. That seemed unlikely since apparently the relevant arrangements had already been finalized. However, perhaps the statement might be included in the special publication to be issued after the commemoration. If the statement was to be delivered, it should certainly be drafted as carefully as possible. Alternatively, the Chairman might make a statement based on the text and taking into account members' suggestions during the press conference to be held later in the session.

46. Mr. ABOUL-NASR confirmed that the arrangements for the fiftieth anniversary commemoration would not allow for the delivery or publication of such a statement.

47. The CHAIRMAN said that the forthcoming press conference afforded a timely opportunity for an appropriate statement by the Committee. In any case, during the recent consultations between the Secretary-General and the Chairmen of the other treaty bodies, he had taken up many of the issues covered in the text prepared by Mr. Banton. He took it that Mr. Sherifis' latter suggestion was acceptable to the members of the Committee.

48. It was so decided.

Draft resolution on the dissemination of racist propaganda on the Internet

49. Mr. BANTON said that the draft resolution was intended to be as simple as possible. He had, however, held consultations with several members, including Mr. Rechetov, who had suggested that it should be expanded considerably and include a reference on the relationship between freedom of expression and the dissemination of racist propaganda. Most members consulted had seemed to favour the original version, but had wondered whether the Sub-Commission on

Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities might adopt a draft resolution similar in content. However, that possibility now appeared unlikely.

50. Mr. SHERIFIS said he was somewhat puzzled by the reference in the second paragraph to child pornography. He failed to understand its relevance to the Convention and considered it unacceptable as the basis for a decision by the Committee. In any case, it would surely be more appropriate for the Sub-Commission to adopt such a draft resolution, since it had broader terms of reference than the Committee.

51. Mr. RECHETOV endorsed Mr. Sherifis' remarks regarding the second preambular paragraph. Moreover, it was unlikely that the General Assembly would accede to the Committee's request in the operative paragraph since such "an appropriate expert body" did not exist in the United Nations system. It was indeed regrettable that the members consulted had not seen fit to endorse his suggestion on an issue of such vital importance. In his view, the Committee was taking a cowardly stance by refusing to acknowledge that the right to freedom of expression was often used as a pretext for the dissemination of racist propaganda. It was only when such abuses resulted in bloodshed and the type of atrocities being committed on the territory of the former Yugoslavia that human rights bodies were prompted to take action. The influence of the Internet in the lives of ordinary people in the very near future should not be underestimated.

52. Mr. FERRERO COSTA said that the draft resolution raised an important issue but he wondered why it dealt exclusively with the Internet. Surely there were other electronic media that disseminated racist propaganda on an international scale. He could agree to the draft resolution as currently worded, subject to the deletion of the reference to "child pornography". Alternatively, a draft resolution of more general scope could be prepared expressing the Committee's concern about such matters and requesting the Centre for Human Rights to carry out appropriate studies.

53. Mr. Sherifis (Vice-Chairman) took the Chair.

54. The CHAIRMAN, speaking in a personal capacity, sought clarification regarding the use of the term "Internet".

55. Mr. BANTON, after providing clarification, said he did not believe that the draft resolution warranted deferring consideration of the Committee's concluding observations on States parties' reports.

56. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that other members should be given an opportunity to state their views on the draft resolution.

57. Mr. ABOUL-NASR, speaking on a point of order, inquired whether Mr. Banton was implying that he would be willing to withdraw his draft resolution.

58. Mr. BANTON said that had not been his intent. However, he would be agreeable to deferral of consideration of the draft until later in the session.

59. Mr. YUTZIS said that, apart from the reference to child pornography, which was quite out of place, Mr. Banton's draft resolution was too insubstantial to constitute an approach to the very important topic of the abuse of the media in general. The Committee should work out an approach to the topic of the use of the media for racist propaganda within the ambit of article 7 of the Convention, whereby States parties undertook to adopt immediate and effective measures, particularly in the fields of teaching, education, culture and information.

60. Mr. Garvalov (Chairman) resumed the Chair.

61. Mr. RECHETOV, speaking on a point of order, asked whether a sponsor could withdraw a proposal that the Committee clearly wanted to continue to discuss.

62. The CHAIRMAN said that, according to the Committee's rules of procedure, a motion could be withdrawn by the member who proposed it at any time before voting on it had commenced.

63. Mr. van BOVEN, speaking on a point of order, asked whether he was correct in assuming that none of the documents before the Committee at the current meeting had actually been withdrawn, though some had been left pending for later consideration.

64. The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that it had decided that consideration of the draft general recommendation on article 3 of the Convention should be deferred until its forty-eighth session for a final decision. Consideration of the draft general recommendation on the right to self-determination had been deferred until the forty-eighth session, at which point the Committee would decide what course to adopt. It had been agreed that the draft letter from the Chairman of the Committee to the Chairman of the 16th meeting of States parties, proposed by Mr. Banton, should be brought before the Committee again for a decision after Mr. Banton had amended the text in accordance with the views that had been expressed. Lastly, the Committee had agreed that he, as Chairman, would deliver the gist of the draft statement (also submitted by Mr. Banton) concerning the participation of the Committee in the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations at his forthcoming press conference.

65. Mr. YUTZIS proposed that the debate on the draft resolution should be closed, and that the Committee should revert to the topic of the abuse of the media when it discussed paragraph 3 of the draft agreed declaration of the joint meeting of the Committee with the Sub-Commission, which referred to a joint study of all aspects of the implementation of article 7 of the Convention.

66. The CHAIRMAN considered that it would be useful to continue the discussion and asked Mr. Yutzis not to press his proposal.

67. Mr. YUTZIS withdrew his proposal but pointed out again that the topic would come up in the discussion of the agreed declaration.

68. Mr. DIACONU said that electronic communication had not yet become a mass medium on the lines of newsprint or radio. He would therefore confine his remarks to the text of the proposed draft resolution. He endorsed the suggestion that the second preambular paragraph should be deleted. In the operative paragraph, he had some doubt about the use of the word "methods", which might imply that the issues were merely technical, whereas advice was also required on legal issues. He suggested, therefore, that the phrase "ways and means" should be substituted for "methods" and that the sentence should end with the words "for the dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority or hatred", taken from article 4 (a), thus tying the resolution more closely to the Convention.

69. Mr. SHAHI said that Mr. Banton had drawn attention to the abuse, through the Internet, of a fundamental obligation of States parties under the Convention. He would therefore support the draft resolution with the amendments proposed by Mr. Diaconu. He reminded the Committee that its annual reports were considered by the Third Committee of the General Assembly. It could draw attention to the topic in its forthcoming report and suggest that the General Assembly should consider how the question of the abuse of electronic communication networks should be dealt with in the light of the various human rights instruments. It was the duty of the Governments of States parties to the Convention to ensure that the private individuals and corporations under their jurisdiction desisted from racist propaganda. The Internet was a private entity. The Committee should therefore emphasize in its report the obligation of States parties to prevent individuals and private organizations which participated in the electronic media from engaging in racist propaganda. Also, in its consideration of the reports of States parties, where there was any evidence of such activity, the Committee should inform the Government concerned that it constituted a violation of article 4 of the Convention. Apart from what the General Assembly might do, therefore, the Committee could take some practical action in the matter, given that it was directly relevant to the implementation of article 4 of the Convention.

70. Mr. AHMADU said that the abuse of electronic communications for racist purposes, not just of the Internet and not just in the developed countries, was a topic that the Committee needed to discuss and to find an effective way of approaching. In his view, the best course might be to wait for the report of a country in which an electronic communication network was located, and in that connection he expressed the hope that a report would be received from the United States of America before long. It could then take the matter up or, if it felt that the case was urgent, it could request specific information. It was important that the Committee should reflect on the issue and decide what approach to take. In the meantime, if the majority was in favour of the draft resolution, he was prepared to support it, provided the second preambular paragraph was deleted and the General Assembly was called upon to take measures rather than take advice to control the abuse of electronic communication networks in general.

71. Mr. ABOUL-NASR said that he did not think the dissemination of racist propaganda on the Internet was very relevant to the Convention. The resolution related to the interests and concerns of a very small minority of Members of the United Nations. Given the many other important issues facing the General Assembly, and the many problems with which the developing

countries had to contend, including racist propaganda of the kind that was prevalent in some European newspapers against Arabs in particular, he did not think the Committee should give it priority attention. However, if Mr. Banton and other members of the Committee thought the issue was sufficiently important, the draft resolution should be expanded and refer in general terms to racist propaganda in all the mass media. He was not clear whether the Committee was actually being asked to pronounce itself on the draft resolution or whether it was engaged merely in an academic discussion.

72. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee was being asked to address the issue as presented in the text of the draft resolution proposed by Mr. Banton.

73. Mr. WOLFRUM said that if the Committee simply wished to concentrate on a minor technical issue, it could perhaps do so on the basis of the draft resolution. As he understood it, however, the discussion of the whole question raised the much broader issue of the interplay between freedom of speech, on the one hand, and freedom of information, on the other. The Committee had touched on that topic in its discussion of general recommendation XV on article 4 of the Convention and, as he recalled, it had taken a long time to reach agreement. He suggested, therefore, that the Committee should carry out a much more detailed study of the whole issue of the interplay between freedom of information and freedom of speech and the restrictions imposed on the latter, in particular under the Convention. The issue of the Internet should perhaps not be overemphasized but it should come into any further study by the Committee of the larger topic.

74. Mr. de GOUTTES said that the role of the media in general with regard to racial discrimination was a very important question. Concerning the Internet in particular, he felt that all members of the Committee needed additional information on the exact charge that was being made against it and how that information could be obtained. It might perhaps be better to approach the matter through the Secretary-General. He did not think that the Committee could address itself directly to the General Assembly. He suggested, therefore, that the Secretary-General should be approached before the Committee adopted any resolution. On the broader issue of the mass media in general, Mr. Yutzis had brought up the question of incitement to racial hatred. The Committee needed to be very firm on that point, and he trusted that the joint declaration of the joint meeting of the Committee and the Sub-Commission would contain a very firm statement on the subject of incitement to racial hatred by the mass media.

75. Mr. YUTZIS said that the Committee was clearly not in a position to analyse in depth the use made of the Internet. The question of the dissemination of racist propaganda by electronic communication networks was, however, important enough to dissuade the Committee from adopting a draft resolution that omitted many of the basic points that could be made. After drawing attention to the reference to article 7 of the Convention in the third paragraph of the draft statement agreed upon by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Sub-Commission, he proposed that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred and that the whole topic of the role played by the media in inciting racial hatred should be dealt with in the joint statement.

76. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution made a very specific proposal. On the other hand, much of the discussion had been concerned with means of tackling the broader issue. The Committee would have to decide how to proceed further.

77. Mr. BANTON said that he would prefer to keep to the narrower course and to that end was ready to accept the amendments proposed by Mr. Diaconu. He did not think that his specific proposal was incompatible with a broader study of the general issues relating to the implementation of article 7. In response to Mr. Rechetov, he said that he himself was not sure what expert body would be appropriate or indeed whether one existed. The world was faced with a new phenomenon and he had worked on the assumption that there was a case for taking action, on the grounds that it might be possible to accomplish something at an early stage which would not be possible later on. Technical innovation tended to move much faster than expected. He felt that it would be useful to distinguish the problem of the Internet from the wider issue of abuse of the mass media in general. Abuses by the print media, for example, could be dealt with by means of the criminal law. His draft resolution was concerned with the technical problems posed by the new medium and the need for technical advice on how to control it.

78. He proposed that the draft resolution should be amended by the deletion of the second preambular paragraph and the replacement of the last part of the operative paragraph, from the words "General Assembly", by the words "to investigate ways and means of controlling the abuse of communication networks, especially the Internet, for diffusing ideas which attempt to justify or promote racial hatred or discrimination in any form". That could initiate action to investigate ways of regulating the medium on an international basis. When the Committee received reports from States parties which it believed were centres of operation of electronic networks, it could take the matter up with them.

79. Mr. YUTZIS said that the draft resolution still seemed to him to be inadequate. There were many other electronic communication networks besides the Internet. There was also a wide range of other information media engaged in racist propaganda.

80. The CHAIRMAN said that there were two courses open to the Committee. It could either request Mr. Banton to produce his amended draft resolution in writing and take it up again at a later meeting, or it could decide that it should remain seized both of the specific issue of the Internet and of the broader issue and should consider both issues at its next session. A decision would be taken at the next meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.